Undertakings attached to them. However, the State Govts, generally issue their own guidelines in this regard.

(b) Where a communication is addressed to a Minister, it should, as far as practicable, be replied to by the Minister. In other cases, a reply should normally be issued under the signature of an officer not below the rank of Joint Secretary. Where, however, a communication is addressed to the head of an attached or subordinate office, it should be replied to by the addresee himself. In mailers involving questions of policy, however, the officer should have prior consultation with appropriate authorities before sending a reply.

केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायाधिकरण में लंबित पड़े मामलें

636. **श्री अजीत जोगी :** क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) गत तीन वर्षों के दौरान विभिन्न केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायाधिकरणों में कर्मचारियों से संबंधित कितने मामले लंबित पड़े हैं;

(ख) क्या सरकार इन मामलों को तेजी से निपटाने के लिए कोई समयबद्ध कार्य योजना प्रारम्भ करने का विचार रखती है; और

(ग) यदि हाँ, तो तत्संबंधी ब्यौरा क्या है ?

कार्मिक लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री और संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री का अतिरिक्त प्रभार (श्रीमती मार्गरिट आल्वा) : (क) 31-12-1990, 31-12-1991 तथा 31-12-1992 की स्थिति के अनुसार, केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायाधिकरण की विभिन्न न्यायपीठों में लम्बित मामलों को दर्शाने वाला एक विवरण संलग्न है । **(नीचे देखिए)**

(ख) और (ग) इन मामलों का तेजी से निपटान करने के लिए केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायाधिकरण में सदस्यों के रिक्त पदों को भरने के लिए कार्यवाही की गई थी, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप बहुत अधिक मामले निपटाए गए । 1990 में 15,488, 1991 में 17,552 तथा 1992 में 25,939 मामले निपटाए गए ।

विवरण

गत तीन वर्षों के दौरान केन्द्रीय प्रशासनिक न्यायाधिकरणों की विभिन्न न्यायपीठों में कर्मचारियों से संबंधित लम्बित मामलों की संख्या निम्न प्रकार है :—

क्र० सं०	न्यायपीठ का नाम	31-12-90	31-12-91	31-12-92
1.	प्रधान न्यायपीठ	7635	9157	8316
2.	अहमदाबाद	1743	1612	1489
3.	इलाहाबाद	*5296	*5793	5159
4.	लखनऊ	—	—	1406
5.	बंगलौर	1183	660	750
6.	बम्बई	2621	2138	2444
7.	कलकत्ता	3796	3780	4023
8.	चण्डीगढ़	2710	3387	3596
9.	कटक	805	958	1159
10.	गुवाहाटी	270	473	646
11.	हैदराबाद	1628	1893	1921
12.	जबलपुर	1504	2017	2361
13.	जोधपुर	#3592	#3779	1242
14.	जयपुर	—	—	2080
15.	मद्रास	1316	1416	1687
16.	पटना	345	606	670
17.	एर्नाकुलम	967	1750	1611
	कुल	35411	39419	40560

* लखनऊ न्यायपीठ के मामलें शामिल हैं ।

\# जयपुर न्यायपीठ के मामलें शामिल हैं ।

Poverty Alleviation Programme

637. SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) the details of the major poverty alleviation programmes under implementation;

(b) what are the targets set under these programmes and achievements made during the last three years: state-wise;

(c) 'whether there was shortfall in achieving the targets:

(d) if so. the reasons thereof: and

(c) the steps taken by Government to remove hurdles in the implementation of these programmes ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT) (SHRI UTTAMBHAI PATEL): *(a)* and (b) The major poverty alleviation programmes under implementation by the Center are (i)

Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) and (ii) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY). The main objective of IRDP is to enable the identified rural poor families to cross the poverty line. Tins *objective* is sought to be achieved by providing income generation assets to the beneficiaries through Government subsidy and bank loan. As regards JRY, this programme aims to generate additional gainful employment for the unemployed/under employed persons both men and women in the mral areas.

Statements giving details of physical targets as well as achievements under these programmes during 1990-91, 1991-92 and 1992-93 are given in Statement-I ana Statement-II.

(c) to (e) In most of the States/Union Territories, the achievements of both the programmes exceeded the targets and there was no shortfall. In all States, concerted efforts were *made to implement the* programmes successfully during the period.

Implementation of IRD and JRY Programmes is constantly monitored and reviewed in consultation with the State Governments in order to remove hurdles, if any, in the implementation of these programmes. Periodic meetings, workshops and conferences are also organised regularly and steps are taken to implement the programmes effectively. Further, Concurrent Evaluation of these programmes is also being undertaken regularly.

Statement I

Physical targets and achievements under I.R.D.P.

an Nos.)

Sl. No.	State/U.T.	1990-91		1991-92		1992-93	
		Target	Achieve	Target	Achieve	Target	Achieve
1.	Andhra Pradesh	174916	263391	165680	222848	138079	179038
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	14922	8423	15022	10888	12519	13642
3.	Assam	43261	50345	15049	16416	37711	40204
4.	Bihar	350469	415814	331578	336972	276337	264252
5.	Goa	3109	3200	3129	2989	2608	2456
6.	Gujarat	72030	72426	68227	72326	56861	61836
7.	Haryana	17236	34179	16326	24756	13606	23349
8.	Himachal Pradesh	6171	17037	5845	11819	4871	6919
9.	J & K	801802	130087	8163	13581	6803	4492
10.	Karnataka	109482	125027	103701	108841	86425	103856
11.	Kerala	59476	60877	56335	57562	46950	50517
12.	Madhya Pradesh	231944	345514	219698	294810	183097	184083
13.	Maharashtra	187364	214199	177472	197967	147906	177651
14.	Manipur	1383	4962	1310	4908	1092	3158
15.	Meghalaya	4149	3134	3930	2874	3275	3011
16.	Mizoram	6217	3366	6259	2811	5216	3474
17.	Nagaland	6528	4429	6572	5442	5477	3329
18.	Oissa	114589	149612	188539	111712	90457	93226
19.	Punjab	14576	35944	13806	27453	11507	25248
20.	Rajasthan	111716	135604	105818	131986	88189	101366
21.	Sikkim	1243	1422	1251	1610	1043	1142
22.	Tamil Nadu	157041	181842	148749	161603	123969	144987
23.	Tripura	4894	12222	4635	16343	3863	11414
24.	Uttar Pradesh	468144	508840	443427	462259	369554	387961

25.	West Bengal	195663	226603	185332	201476	154457	171695
26.	A & N Islands	1554	1660	1564	1502	1304	646
27.	Chandigarh	—	—	—	—	—	—
28.	Delhi	311	311	312	313	522	524
29.	Daman & Diu	1554	1567	1564	530	521	520
30.	D & N Haveli	622	600	625	482	183	300
31.	Lakshadweep	150	139	150	124	133	156
32.	Pondicherry	1243	2078	1251	1343	1043	1043
	All India	2370575	2897775	2251519	2536566	1875135	2064975

Statement II

Physical targets and achievement under JRY

(Lakh Mandays)

S. No.	State/UT	1990-91		1991-92		1992-93	
		Target	Achieve-ment	Target	Achieve-ment	Target	Achieve-ment
1.	Andhra Pradesh	919.98	810.66	698.88	680.41	559.76	677.93
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	12.40	8.44	12.47	6.57	10.01	3.31
3.	Assam	122.70	126.02	100.94	124.02	119.72	109.72
4.	Bihar	1125.86	1130.05	893.77	836.73	937.94	1036.16
5.	Goa	11.91	8.88	10.96	9.56	8.36	8.12
6.	Gujarat	242.72	188.82	244.25	254.13	236.73	228.65
7.	Haryana	37.60	35.03	37.67	38.49	33.71	32.63
8.	Himachal Pradesh	33.68	35.86	30.47	34.16	29.77	26.16
9.	J. & K.	61.68	54.27	95.88	60.37	62.87	17.47
10.	Karnataka	570.87	486.56	418.36	401.64	441.08	418.29
11.	Kerala	244.83	180.96	138.98	177.08	138.63	134.54
12.	Madhya Pradesh	1156.31	958.57	812.43	945.39	643.77	709.66
13.	Maharashtra	859.99	850.22	654.72	771.64	838.77	823.53
14.	Manipur	9.83	12.16	3.87	5.11	9.84	5.23
15.	Meghalaya	18.98	7.88	23.07	12.02	11.61	8.90
16.	Mizoram	4.48	19.69	3.71	5.95	4.37	4.78
17.	Nagaland	21.26	18.98	21.71	27.92	20.74	13.47
18.	Oissa	324.61	341.97	300.09	348.86	306.52	326.39
19.	Punjab	31.72	21.81	29.42	19.76	24.67	31.78
20.	Rajasthan	392.43	506.01	242.64	387.63	340.62	339.09
21.	Sikkim	7.91	8.80	9.58	13.62	6.66	13.40
22.	Tamil Nadu	688.95	755.21	521.03	831.73	671.94	767.86
23.	Tripura	19.81	19.06	19.02	20.71	18.10	13.93
24.	Uttar Pradesh	1703.11	1628.27	1472.69	1562.14	1389.00	1496.29
25.	West Bengal	643.16	516.85	544.08	491.99	557.24	525.55
26.	A. & N. Islands	4.44	2.97	2.68	2.18	4.47	1.71

27. Chandigarh	1.08	0.11	—	—	—	—
28. Delhi	5.12	0.89	—	—	—	—
29. Daman & Diu	1.61	0.63	1.45	0.88	1.63	0.12
30. D. & N. Haveli	3.47	2.84	3.51	3.94	3.55	2.17
31. Lakshadweep	2.62	2.23	2.64	2.23	2.55	2.68
32. Pondicherry	5.87	4.89	3.37	5.10	3.32	3.81
All India	9291.04	8745.59	7354.35	8081.06	7537.95	7783.33

Conference of State Ministers of Panchayati Raj

638. SHRI SHANTI TYAGI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether a conference of State Ministers and Secretaries in charge of Panchayati Raj in States was inaugurated by the Prime Minister in New Delhi in the first week of July; and

(b) if so. the details of recommendations made by this conference ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT) (SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A Statement is enclosed.

Statement

Conference of Ministers and Secretaries in-charge of Panchayats of States and Union Territories on the Constitution (73rd) Amendment Act, 1992.

Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi July 3, 1993

Recommendations

As a consequence of the Constitution 73rd Amendment Act, 1992 the legislations in the respective States have to be amended. Work on this process has already commenced in all the States. It was agreed that the new legislation will be placed before the next Session of the respective State Assemblies.

Further, steps would be taken to hold elections to Panchayati raj institutions where they are due within six months after these legislative changes are brought into force.

It was agreed that the provisions relating to the constitution of District Planning Committees provided in the Constitution (74th) Amendment Act, 1992 would form a part of the new Panchayati Raj legislation of the States.

All the States agreed to constitute the Slate Election Commission as required under Article 243K (i) and (ii) of the Constitution (73rd) Amendment Act, 1992 as soon as the legislations are enacted in each state. It was decided that it may be examined as to how this couid be done without high additional expenditure,

It was generally agreed that at least the elections to the Gram Panchayats be held on nonparty basis with a view to preventing continued feuds at the village level and to also prevent impediments in development.

The Nyaya Panchayats were considered as a good mechanism for speedy and inexpensive resolution of local disputes. It was suggested that they may form a part of the proposed panchayats raj legislation in the states or may be legislated separately. A detailed examination may be made of the issues involved in setting up Nyaya Panchayats.

It was agreed that the cordinal principle for distribution of powers and functions at each level of Panchayat must be that what can be done at a given level should be done at that level alone and not at a higher level. It was not enough to merely list outed series of subjects generously, but it was necessary to ensure that in respect of each subject the functions to be performed at each level of Panchayat should be clearly identified and entrusted to them. Clear delegation of powers, provision of necessary, manpower from existing Departments of Governments/Public Agencies and powers to poor resources and undertake integrated local development are required to make the entrustment of functions effective. While entrusting the functions and powers, convergence of services like those of education, health, women and child development, nutrition and family welfare may also be kept in view to maximise local participation and accrual of benefits to the local community.